



104.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP-34084-2025

Date of decision: 16.01.2026

Lakhveer Kaur, through her SPA Rajinder Pal Singh Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. R.S. Rangpuri, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Satnampreet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner, who is presently residing in Brampton, Ontario, Canada, has invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court by filing the instant petition, through her Special Power of Attorney-Rajinder Pal Singh (father-in-law of the petitioner), under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of directions to the respondents to extend the date of joining of the petitioner in pursuance to the appointment order dated 06.08.2025 (Annexure P-3), and quash the order dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure P-5) vide which, the offer of appointment has been cancelled.

2. Brief facts, as have been pleaded in the present petition, are that the mother-in-law of the petitioner, namely, Mandeep Kaur, was posted as Anganwari worker at Village Bhalaiana Centre under Block Kot Bhai at Gidderbaha, and she unfortunately died on 14.05.2024. The petitioner, being daughter-in-law of the deceased-worker, applied for appointment on compassionate ground and submitted all the necessary documents with respondent No.4 on 19.07.2024, but, however, no action was taken by

respondent No.4 on the application of the petitioner. Thereafter, she went abroad on temporary basis in December, 2024, by giving authority to her father-in-law to take necessary steps regarding her appointment. Thereafter, vide letter dated 06.08.2025 (Annexure P-3), the petitioner was offered appointment, and was assigned the work of Anganwari worker and directed to join her duties within 15 days. The SPA of the petitioner visited the office of respondent No.4 and apprised her about non-availability of the petitioner and requested to extend the date of joining upto the last week of October, 2025, so that the petitioner can windup the things in abroad and can come back to join her duties. But, however, respondent No.4, vide letter No.588, dated 20.08.2025, asked the petitioner to join duty within 03 days. Thereafter, the SPA of the petitioner again submitted representation dated 25.08.2025 (Annexure P-4), in the office of respondent No.4, seeking more time to join the duty, but however, the said representation was rejected, vide order dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure P-5), and the offer of appointment issued to the petitioner, vide letter dated 06.08.2025, was cancelled. The petitioner through her SPA got issued a legal notice dated 06.09.2025 (Annexure P-7), demanding the extension of date of joining of the petitioner, but to no avail. It is the said order dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure P-5), which has been impugned by way of present writ petition.

3. The matter came up for hearing on 17.11.2025 and the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks an adjournment to place on record the policy/instructions of the

Government which provide right of appointment to the Daughter-in-law.

Adjourned to 18.12.2025.”

On 18.12.2025, the matter was adjourned for today. However, the policy/instructions have not been placed on record by the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the action of the respondent in cancelling the offer of appointment, vide impugned order dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure P-5), is totally illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional, as the petitioner is living abroad and had requested through her attorney to extend the period of joining. However, the said request has been rejected by the respondents in a totally illegal and arbitrary manner.

5. On receipt of advance copy of the petition, Mr. Satnampreet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab, appears and submits that the petitioner was issued offer of appointment on 06.08.2025 and she was asked to join her duties within 15 days and on the request made on her behalf, she was again asked to join her duties within 03 days, vide letter dated 20.08.2025, but, however, she failed to join her duties, therefore, her offer of appointment has rightly been cancelled by the respondents.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Although no policy/instructions have been placed on record which confers right upon the petitioner, who is daughter-in-law of the deceased worker, working as Anganwari worker, to claim compassionate

appointment, however, even if the appointment of the petitioner, vide order dated 06.08.2025, is held to be legal and valid, still as per the terms and conditions of the offer of appointment, she was required to join her duties within 15 days as there was a stipulation in clause 2 of the appointment letter, that if she fails to join within 15 days, the offer of appointment will be considered as cancelled and while cancelling this appointment, no other dependent will be given its benefit in future nor will the case be reconsidered. But, however, on the request of the petitioner, which was made through her attorney, the time for her joining was extended for 03 days, vide letter dated 20.08.2025, but still the petitioner did not join her duties within the extended time. Therefore, the action of the respondent in cancelling the offer of appointment vide impugned order dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure P-5) cannot be said to be illegal and arbitrary.

8. In view of the foregoing discussion, it is evident that the petitioner failed to join her duties in time, and remained abroad despite being granted sufficient opportunity to join her duties. The respondent has, therefore, rightly proceeded in accordance with law. Accordingly, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed in limine.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

16.01.2026
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No